

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES
October 22, 2008

Chair Knox White called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:35 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL** – Roll was called and the following recorded.

Members Present:

John Knox White
Michael Krueger
Jane Lee
Robert McFarland (arrived after Roll Call)
Kathy Moehring
Eric Schatmeier
Srikant Subramaniam

Staff Present:

Obaid Khan, Supervising Civil Engineer
Barry Bergman, Transportation Coordinator
Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. September 24, 2008

Commissioner Moehring moved approval of the minutes for the September 24, 2008, meeting and minutes as presented. *Commissioner Krueger* seconded the motion. Motion passed 6-0.

3. **AGENDA CHANGES**

There were none.

4. **COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS**

- a. **Pedestrian Plan**
 - b. **Bicycle Plan Update Group**
 - c. **Alameda Point Advisory Task Force**

Chair Knox White noted that none of the task forces had met since the last meeting.

5. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS**

None.

7. **NEW BUSINESS**

7A. Review of SunCal Company's Redevelopment Concept Plan for Alameda Point

Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager, presented the SunCal Preliminary Redevelopment Concept for Alameda Point, with a focus on its transportation strategy. He noted that the document was an important milestone in the redevelopment process for Alameda Point, and was the first major submittal by the SunCal Companies that was intended to lead to a final plan for Alameda Point, which would then lead to Alameda Point's actual redevelopment. He detailed the background of this item, and noted that the plan was submitted on September 19, 2008, and that City staff was reviewing the plan, concurrently with the Alameda community and the Alameda boards and commissions. Weekly meetings have been held with those boards and commissions, focusing on various aspects of the plan. Once comments have been received from all boards and commissions, staff will present all the comments to City Council on November 5, 2008, sitting as the ARRA. He added that the Draft Master Plan will be submitted to the City by December 19, 2008. Staff believed the transportation issue was probably the most difficult and significant issue to tackle for Alameda Point, which was an extremely complex development. Staff was very concerned that SunCal put together a strong transportation plan to complement the land use plan. Staff believed it was very important to have a transportation strategy that can actually be implemented. He noted that in addition to Pat Kelleher, SunCal Companies was also represented by Nick Kosla and Sara Chavez.

Mr. Pat Kelleher, SunCal Companies, noted that this was a very challenging site for a number of different reasons, and added that understanding the physical site constraints was critical to understanding how Alameda Point could be developed. He noted that one of the constraints was the PDC floodplain, which was assumed during the PDC process. He displayed a PowerPoint presentation. He noted that one critical item was determining whether or not the finished floor levels of the historic buildings would be out of the flood plain. They did not believe it would be feasible to fill between six to ten feet of dirt around the buildings. He noted that a significant portion of the finished floor levels was above the floodplain. He noted that the environmental conditions had not changed from the PDC, and that the environmental cleanup issues were a current concern. He described the presence of the young bay mud, which was subject to differential settlement issues, and loosely consolidated sand on the side closest to the marina and seaplane lagoon hangars were subject to liquefaction.

Mr. Kelleher noted that Peter Calthorpe, the urban planner, had four guiding principles: diversity and balance in the project; human and pedestrian scale; conservation and restoration; and connections and interdependence. He noted that there had been an extensive community planning process, and that three large workshops had been held, attended by approximately 700 people. He added that they had done considerable polling, and that many comment cards had been received. He described the proposed affordable housing units, and noted that connectivity within the site was critical. He displayed the layout for four soccer fields, as well as football and lacrosse fields, and four baseball fields. He noted that diverse housing opportunities would be important to the project's

success, such as single-family homes, townhomes, live-work, multifamily tuck-under, senior housing, workforce housing, commercial development, and mixed use retail. He noted that a diverse housing mix enables more flexible and effective reaction to a changing marketplace.

Mr. Matthew Ridgway, Fehr & Peers, noted that Megan Mitman's name should be on the slide as well, due to her significant contribution to this work in close coordination with the City. He augmented Mr. Thomas' comments on the contractual arrangement on this project. He noted that while SunCal provided the funding, Fehr and Peers' contract was with the City of Alameda. He displayed a series of slides illustrating present and future auto congestion, which they anticipated would become worse with or without the Alameda Point development. He noted that they encouraged people to use alternate transportation modes as much as possible. He noted that there was no draw on the General Fund, and that the project was at least fiscally neutral.

Mr. Ridgway detailed the six guiding principles of this project:

1. Attract eco-minded residents and tenants. All residents and businesses will pay for an ecopass program, whether they use it or not;
2. Create a self-sufficient community, with shopping, work, child care, educational (elementary school) and recreational opportunities on-site;
3. Provide the best transportation services and facilities in the city, with a dedicated shuttle to connect to the 12th Street BART in Oakland in the initial phase. A Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system with two routes (between Alameda Point and 12th Street BART, as well as to the Fruitvale BART station) will be implemented.

He noted that the proposed addition of the new ferry terminal at the seaplane lagoon would enhance ferry operations. He noted that the Transportation Coordinator would host regular transportation fairs and organize rideshare matching. He detailed the route and operations of the dedicated shuttle line, and added that a new shuttle would augment the 63 route. He estimated that the costs for the overall transit improvements would be between \$35-50 million.

4. Provide Island-wide benefits for the City. He noted that reduction in auto use must be implemented to free up the capacity for the additional travel associated with the development of Alameda Point. He noted that it was expected that there would be a 2-4% reduction in motor vehicle trips, and a significant increase in infrastructure to accomplish that goal. The BRT system would be an addition to the transit choices. The bikeway system would provide an additional benefit, and that a trail facility would be extended along the former Alameda Belt Line corridor along the length of the Island. The \$5-7 million cost would be built into the development *pro forma*. The system would provide additional travel and recreational opportunities, as well as travel to the Ferry Terminal.

5. Limit vehicle trips to and from Alameda, and the inclusion of a car and bike share program. The cost of parking would be unbundled from the cost of purchasing the residential units. The second parking space would cost incrementally more than the first space, and ride-share and alternative fuel vehicles would have the opportunity to have premium on- and off-street parking. As little parking as practical would be provided, and it would be managed as best as possible to obtain the highest and best use of it.
6. Implementation and monitoring of the more successful programs by an on-site transportation manager.

Mr. Ridgway displayed each phase of the proposed project and described the high points of each phase.

Commissioner Krueger noted that he would be concerned if the proposed BRT station west of Main Street were to be split, and that there could be a conflict between having the station or maintaining the large landscaped area at that location. Mr. Ridgway replied that they would examine that issue in detail.

Commissioner McFarland noted that page 106 discussed the reduction of commercial trips by 30%, and residential trips by 10%. He inquired how the percentage was measured. Mr. Ridgway replied it was based on anticipated peak hour trips.

In response to an inquiry by *Commissioner Moehring* regarding the guaranteed ride home, Mr. Ridgway replied that it would enable people to feel comfortable using transit, and that it would probably entail a contract with a taxi company. It would allow transit users to be reimbursed for a taxi ride home for unanticipated trips home.

Commissioner Moehring requested clarification of the additional cost of a second vehicle, and whether an alternative fuel vehicle would receive a discount. Mr. Ridgway noted that they were more concerned about congestion than fuel type.

Commissioner Krueger inquired about the statement on the shuttle on page 109, specifically that it would operate every 10 to 15 minutes. He inquired whether it was for the peak commute, or throughout the day. Mr. Ridgway replied that he did not have the information at hand.

Commissioner Krueger noted that page 199 addressed the market-based fees for street parking, and inquired about the management for lot capacity for the market-based off-street solution. Mr. Ridgway noted that they made assumptions about the parking revenue consistent with their operating revenue assumptions. He noted that they would want to encourage people to use the Ferry Island-wide. *Commissioner Krueger* liked the market-based approach, and suggested that if the parking lot was empty, the fee should be cut. However, if the parking lot was above 85% full, it would be possible to charge a higher fee without discouraging anybody.

Staff Thomas noted that staff intended to bring the Transportation Element before the Planning Board on November 24, 2008, for the final recommendation to the City Council for their hearing in early January, 2009.

Commissioner Lee expressed concern about school budgeting which can cause student diversion from Ruby Bridges to Bay Farm Elementary School because of classes at capacity. In terms of transportation, she believed that would be a nightmare. She believed the plan was innovative, and liked the idea of the EcoPass.

Commissioner Moehring requested that with respect to the intersections at Webster Street, that the Business District should be a part of discussions because of the impact on the Business District. She noted that traffic turning onto Webster was a concern to her.

Open public hearing.

Mr. Stuart Ricard expressed concern about the Tubes, and inquired about the number of trips in the Tube with and without the mitigations and the project.

Ms. Mitman noted that the preliminary traffic numbers in the Tube with the project would be 2,000 vehicles in the morning, about 1,300 inbound, and 750 outbound; about 1,960 vehicles would use the Tube in the afternoon, with 790 inbound and 1,200 outbound. She noted that was slightly higher than the PDC numbers, and that the numbers reflected full buildout, but without the 2% islandwide credit. She further described the numbers at Mr. Ricard's request.

Mr. Ricard expressed concern about locating retail at the outer portions of the Island, and believed it would be better to have it more centrally located. He was also concerned about impact on the Tube, and inquired about the number of units west of Grand Street. Mr. Ricard stated that this was the time to make a decision about this development, and not let it get so big that it cannot be affected. He believed there were huge benefits to this project, but was also concerned about the impact on the Tube.

Mr. Bill Smith expressed concern about congestion in the Tube, and noted that the recumbent bicycle he has developed will also be available as a free public transit vehicle. He supported public/private peer-to-peer financing such as that utilized with solar energy.

Close public hearing.

Commissioner Schatmeier noted that this document was an exciting item, and believed that it was essential for the development to provide alternatives for people from Day 1. He believed this kind of strategy was important in attracting people to such a development. He understood that details about headways were still forthcoming, and this development would make it possible for people to travel the Island without using an automobile. He discussed the last round of service cuts at AC Transit, and noted that the 63 had been a catch-all line. He believed that because the 63 was supposed to do everything, it didn't do anything very well. He suggested running the 63 on 15-minute

headways, rather than 30-minute headways. He would like the 63 to be rethought in a significant manner.

Commissioner Moehring appreciated the innovation, creativity and diversity in this plan, and especially appreciated SunCal's flexibility in working with the community.

Commissioner Krueger noted that on page 57, the intersection of Atlantic and Orion was very good, but that the potential BRT station planning needed to be integrated into the site design, because the station would be a potential focal point. He noted that Fruitvale was an example of how bad planning of a station can ruin an otherwise great development. He would like to avoid having a split station. He noted that on page 108, there was a typo in the Mode Choice section, stating that residents would have a 10-mile walk to the ferry, and that it should read "10-minute" walk to the ferry. He noted that on page 109, the shuttle frequency should be clarified. He believed that the parking lots at the transit station should be managed in a market-driven way, the same as the street parking.

Chair Knox White was happy to see that the personal rapid transit (PRT) was underplayed, and while the technology would become developed in the future, he did not believe it was the right use for this development. He noted that under Commercial, the document identified three parking spaces per 1,000 square feet, which was 25% lower than Alameda's current minimum. He believed the plan was a good one from a transportation standpoint, and should be backed up by realistic data. He hoped the plan could move forward in a timely manner.

No action was taken.

8. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Knox White noted that he had received an email about the new traffic signal at Atlantic and Webster, stating that inbound cars turning right and west on Atlantic were running the red light because they were used to the old configuration.

a. Estuary Crossing Feasibility Study

Staff Khan noted that he was not present at the two public meetings that were held during October, and that he had not received the feedback from the consultant. He would present that information at the next meeting.

b. Broadway/Jackson Update

Staff Khan noted that the project study report has been submitted to CalTrans, and that they had not scheduled or budgeted the project study report (PSR). Staff was currently working on incorporating the PSR.

c. Monitoring of Oak Street/Central Avenue intersection

Staff Khan noted that he had originally planned to bring it to this meeting, but it was delayed and will be brought at the November 12, 2009, meeting.

Chair Knox White inquired whether the changes were necessary, and he hoped the report would indicate whether the traffic generated in that area would have caused the concerns, particularly the traffic blockage on Park Street.

In response to an inquiry by *Commissioner Krueger* whether traffic counts had been conducted, *Staff Khan* replied that they were done.

Chair Knox White inquired about the results of the traffic counts, and how they compared.

Staff Khan replied that staff used the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) analysis, and that the information would be brought forward at a later date. Generally, staff found the impact to be much less than what was cited in the MND.

d. Upcoming development-related traffic studies and plans

Staff Khan noted that staff would keep the Transportation Commission updated on further SunCal updates.

e. Future meeting agenda items

Staff Khan noted that the Final EIR comments for the Transportation Master Plan would be brought forward on the November 12, 2009, meeting or later in November in a joint meeting with the Planning Board.

Staff Khan noted that the parking study for the Business District will be brought forward either in November or December.

Commissioner McFarland noted that he drove to work from High Street to I-880, and noticed a lot of activity on the road by the Shell station in Oakland. He inquired about the status of the I-880 widening work, and noticed a lot of utility and drainage work. *Staff Khan* replied that the plans were to start some of the work in 2009. He added that the project would be coordinated with the County's work as well. He added that CalTrans planned to do most of the work at night, without closing lanes during the day.

Staff Bergman noted that the Interagency Liaison Committee meeting had been held with AC Transit, which had collected some data in September about the changes on Line 63, and how they affected run times. Each proposed change at Alameda Point and near Encinal High School was anticipated to gain about two minutes each.

Chair Knox White noted that *Staff Bergman* mentioned that the City did not receive the grant to fund a long-range transit plan update. He believed that in terms of the casual carpool issue, the City should be careful to prioritize things. He proposed that in November or December, either staff or a Transportation Commission subcommittee should develop a scope of work for a long-range transit plan update.

Staff Bergman noted that Walk and Roll to School Day had been held earlier in the month, and that he would report to the Transportation Commission on the participation numbers once they become available. He noted that Alameda was very active in the elementary and middle school participation.

Staff Bergman noted that both of the City's Safe Routes to School grant applications did not receive funding.

Commissioner Krueger noted that the new bus stop work on Shoreline looked very good, and was glad to see the paving taking place. He inquired whether the bus stop on Versailles and Fernside had been red curbed. *Commissioner McFarland* replied that it had been red curbed.

ADJOURN: 9:30 p.m.

G:\pubworks\LT\TRANSPORTATION\COMMITTEES\TC\2008\111208\102208minutes-final.doc